

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 12-23 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12-15 and 17 are rejected. Claims 3, 10, 11 and 16 are objected to. Claims 7-11 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 6 and 12 have been amended. New Claims 18-23 have been added for examination. The specification and drawings stand as filed.

Reconsideration of the objections and rejections set forth in the aforementioned Office Action is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. The basis for the amendments can be found throughout the Specification, Claims and Drawings as originally filed.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to their representative, Donald G. Walker, during a telephonic interview conducted on November 6, 2003. During the interview, U.S. Patent No. 5,951,216 to Antoun was discussed in view of the rejections made by the Examiner. During the interview, Applicants argued that Antoun did not disclose the step of setting a target coolant pressure to be obtained between the cutting tool and the workpiece as recited in claim 12. Applicants further supported this argument by noting that Antoun describes an involved process where a computer is programmed with information concerning a cutting tool and that the computer determines an ideal pump speed and sends a control signal to a variable frequency drive based on the programmed information. The control signal sets the frequency of the drive, which in turn determines the pump motor speed (Col. 2, lines 1-10). Furthermore, Applicants noted that Antoun described certain steps as being "critical." At Col. 4, lines 2-5, Antoun states that a computer needs to be

programmed with a critical relationship of the frequency required to drive the pump at a speed that results in a desired coolant pressure. Applicants argued that these statements were not a disclosure of the step of setting a target coolant pressure pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The Examiner disagreed and an agreement was not reached.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Antoun.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to note that the target pressure is determined independently from the operating characteristics of the pump. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Antoun does not anticipate amended claim 1 because Col. 4, lines 2-5 of Antoun note a critical relationship that the computer needs to be programmed with the frequency required to drive the pump at a speed that results in a desired coolant pressure.

With regard to claim 12, claim 12 has been amended to include the step of setting a target coolant pressure to be obtained between the cutting tool and the workpiece independent of the operating characteristics of the system. As mentioned earlier, Antoun specifically requires a frequency required to drive the pump at a speed which results in a desired coolant pressure. Furthermore, the computer of Antoun is programmed with information concerning the cutting tool and that the control system regulates the speed of the coolant pump based on the total area of the coolant tool orifices (Col. 2, lines 1-10).

Furthermore, Applicants have added independent claim 18 which is substantially similar to originally filed claim 12 but includes the preamble "a method of controlling coolant flow consisting essentially of:" As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Antoun does not present a bar to patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because Antoun recites additional steps, at least one of them being critical, which are not present in new claim 18. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to allow claim 18.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Antoun.

With respect to claims 4-6, Applicants have amended claim 1 as previously noted. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully rely on the amendment to claim 1 and arguments previously set forth. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103 rejections.

Applicants have cancelled claims 7-9.

With respect to claim 14, Applicants have amended claim 12 as previously mentioned. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103 rejections.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 3, 10, 11 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have re-written dependent claim 3 in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims as new claim 19.

In addition, Applicants have re-written claim 16 in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims as new claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass the case to allowance.

CONCLUSION

All of the grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding office action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If it is believed that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600. Prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated November 11, 2003

By Donald G. Walker
Donald G. Walker – Reg. No. 44390
Attorneys for Applicants

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.
P. O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
Phone: 248/641-1600
Facsimile: 248/641-0270